

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
AT CHARLESTON**

STEVEN WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:24-cv-00044

WILLIAM MARSHALL  
*DCR Commissioner and*  
JARROD WILSON  
*MOCC Disciplinary Hearing Officer and*  
JONATHAN FRAME  
*MOCC Deputy Superintendent and*  
SHERIE MEYERS  
*MOCC Executive Assistant and*  
WILLIAM MEADOWS  
*MOCC Investigator and*  
MATTHEW ISAACS  
*MOCC Correctional Officer, Sergeant and*  
RICHARD CARTE  
*MOCC Inmate Movement Coordinator and*  
RICHARD TONY  
*Chief of Security and*  
SAMUEL SAVILLA  
*MOCC Acting Major and*  
JOSH WARD  
*MOCC Associate Superintendent of Security and*  
DERRICK MCKINNEY  
*MOCC Associate Superintendent of Operations,*

Defendants.

**ORDER**

Pending are Defendants' Motion to Dismiss [Doc. 22], filed May 6, 2024, and Plaintiff Steve Williams' Motion for Leave to Amend and Supplement Complaint [Doc. 29], filed June 17, 2024. This action was previously referred to the Honorable Dwane L. Tinsley, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation ("PF&R").

Magistrate Judge Tinsley filed his PF&R on February 20, 2025. [Doc. 39]. Magistrate Judge Tinsley recommended that the Court grant the Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, deny Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend and Supplement Complaint, and remove this matter from the Court's docket.

The Court need not review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (“A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations *to which objection is made.*” (emphasis added)). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal the Court's order. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also United States v. De Leon-Ramirez*, 925 F.3d 177, 181 (4th Cir. 2019) (Parties may not typically “appeal a magistrate judge's findings that were not objected to below, as § 636(b) doesn't require de novo review absent objection.”); *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989). Further, the Court need not conduct de novo review when a party “makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982).


Objections in this case were due on March 14, 2025. [Doc. 43]. Mr. Williams' objections were filed on March 13, 2025. [Doc. 44]. He objects to “any and all proposed findings and recommendation made by [the] Magistrate Judge” and “stand[s] by his complaint.” Such general and conclusory objection does not direct the Court to any specific error to Magistrate Judge Tinsley's PF&R.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R [**Doc. 39**], **GRANTS** the Defendants' Motion to Dismiss [**Doc. 22**], **DENIES** Mr. Williams' Motion for Leave to Amend and Supplement Complaint [**Doc. 29**], **DISMISSES** the Complaint **WITHOUT PREJUDICE** [**Doc. 2**], and **DISMISSES** the matter.

The Court directs the Clerk to transmit a copy of this Order to any counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: March 14, 2025



  
Frank W. Volk  
Chief United States District Judge